



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,541	03/29/2004	Robert T. Uthe	4541-019	2249
67419	7590	12/05/2007		
COATS & BENNETT/IBM			EXAMINER	
1400 CRESCENT GREEN			WONG, WILLIAM	
SUITE 300				
CARY, NC 27518			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/811,541

Applicant(s)

UTHE ET AL.

Examiner

William Wong

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the communication filed on September 24, 2007.

- Claims 1, 14, 16, and 18 have been amended.

Claims 1-19 are pending and have been examined. Previous objections to the specification are maintained. Previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement have been withdrawn in view of amendments. Previous claim rejections have been withdrawn in view of amendments.

Specification

1. The use of the trademarks has been noted in this application (e.g. in paragraph 12 of page 3, IBM and SUN MICROSYSTEMS). It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 5-9, and 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slatter (US 2003/0025812 A1) in view of Leshem (US 6,341,310).

As per independent claim 1, Slatter teaches **a method of zooming in/out a current display of a visualization of resources** (e.g. in paragraphs 1-2, 45, and 55-59), **each said resource having zero or more attributes** (e.g. in paragraphs 15-16 and 35-36), **and each resource being a resource of interest if it has at least one attribute that matches predetermined criteria** (e.g. in paragraphs 15-16 and 35-36), **comprising: computing a future display area zoomed in/out from said current display by an initial factor** (e.g. in paragraph 15, *generates crop boundaries for each area of interest* and in paragraph 26-27, *view that area of interest with a level of zoom selected automatically by the image processor or determined by the user*); **positioning said future display area over said visualization to include the largest possible number of resources of interest** (e.g. in paragraph 28, *include as many of the areas of interest as possible*); **and replacing said current display with a view of said future display area** (e.g. in paragraph 14 and paragraph 29, *shows each of the views in turn*), but does not specifically teach wherein the visualization of resources include a visualization of **network** resources. However, Leshem teaches a visualization of network resources (e.g. in abstract and figures 1-3), each network resource being of interest to the user if an attribute of the resource matches a predetermined criteria (e.g. in column 3 lines 1-3 and 21-30). Leshem further teaches zooming in and out of the visualization of network resources to allow the user to focus on the resources of interest

(e.g. in column 2 lines 27-32 and 55-57 and figures 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the zoom techniques of Slatter to the visualization of Leshem for the purpose of allowing the user to automatically focus on the resources of interest.

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **following positioning said future display area, further zooming in/out said future display area until resources of interest are proximate at least two edges of said future display area** (figure 2, paragraph 28, and paragraph 50).

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **wherein said initial factor is predetermined** (e.g. in paragraph 26).

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **wherein said initial factor is specified by a user** (e.g. in paragraph 26).

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **wherein said resources of interest are visually distinguished in said current display** (e.g. in paragraph 25).

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **wherein said resources of interest are visually distinguished by displaying indicia of interest associated with said resources** (e.g. in paragraph 25).

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **wherein said attributes that match predetermined criteria are predetermined** (e.g. in paragraphs 16, 35-36, and 49).

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **wherein said resources of interest have different degrees of priority, wherein at least one said resource of interest has a higher priority than at least one other resource of interest** (e.g. in paragraphs 35-36).

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **wherein positioning said future display area to include the largest possible number of resources of interest comprises positioning said future display area to include the largest possible number of resources having said higher priority** (e.g. in paragraphs 28 and 35-36).

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **wherein, if said future display area cannot include more than one resource of interest, positioning said future display area to include the largest possible number of resources of interest comprises positioning said future display area such that a single resource of interest is centered in said future display area** (e.g. in paragraphs 50).

As per independent claim 14, Slatter teaches **a method of zooming in a current display of a visualization of resources** (e.g. in paragraphs 1-2, 45, and 55-59), **each said resource having zero or more attributes** (e.g. in paragraphs 15-16 and 35-36), **and each resource being a resource of interest if it has at least one attribute that matches predetermined criteria** (e.g. in paragraphs 15-16 and 35-36), **comprising: computing a future display area zoomed in from said current display by an initial factor** (e.g. in paragraph 15, *generates crop boundaries for each area of interest* and in

paragraph 26-27, *view that area of interest with a level of zoom selected automatically by the image processor or selected by the user*); **positioning said future display area over said visualization to encompass the largest possible number of resources of interest** (e.g. in paragraph 28, *include as many of the areas of interest as possible*); **if the largest possible number of resources of interest that said future display area can encompass is one, positioning said future display area such that said one resource of interest is centered in said future display area** (e.g. in paragraphs 50); **and replacing said current display with a view of said future display area** (e.g. in paragraph 14 and paragraph 29, *shows each of the views in turn*), but does not specifically teach wherein the visualization of resources include a visualization of **network** resources. However, Leshem teaches a visualization of network resources (e.g. in abstract and figures 1-3), each network resource being of interest to the user if an attribute of the resource matches a predetermined criteria (e.g. in column 3 lines 1-3 and 21-30). Leshem further teaches zooming in and out of the visualization of network resources to allow the user to focus on the resources of interest (e.g. in column 2 lines 27-32 and 55-57 and figures 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the zoom techniques of Slatter to the visualization of Leshem for the purpose of allowing the user to automatically focus on the resources of interest.

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **prior to replacing said current display: if said largest possible number of resources of interest that said future display area can encompass is at least two,**

further zooming and positioning said future display area such that a resource of interest is proximate at least two edges of said future display area (figure 2, paragraph 28, and paragraph 50).

As per independent claim 16, Slatter teaches a **computer system, comprising: a display device** (e.g. in paragraph 38, *a display*); **memory** (e.g. in paragraph 30); **and a processor operatively connected to said display device and said memory** (e.g. in paragraphs 14, 30, and 38), **for executing code operative to produce a current display on said display device depicting a visualization of resources** (e.g. in paragraphs 1-2, 45, and 55-59), **each said resource having zero or more attributes** (e.g. in paragraphs 15-16 and 35-36), **and each said resource being a resource of interest if it has at least one attribute that matches predetermined criteria** (e.g. in paragraphs 15-16 and 35-36), **said processor operative to perform the steps of: computing a future display area zoomed in/out from said current display by an initial factor** (e.g. in paragraph 15, *generates crop boundaries for each area of interest* and in paragraph 26-27, *view that area of interest with a level of zoom selected automatically by the image processor or selected by the user*); **positioning said future display area over said visualization to include the largest possible number of resources of interest** (e.g. in paragraph 28, *include as many of the areas of interest as possible*); **and replacing said current display with a view of said future display area** (e.g. in paragraph 14 and paragraph 29, *shows each of the views in turn*), but does not specifically teach wherein the visualization of resources include a visualization of **network** resources. However, Leshem teaches a visualization of network resources

(e.g. in abstract and figures 1-3), each network resource being of interest to the user if an attribute of the resource matches a predetermined criteria (e.g. in column 3 lines 1-3 and 21-30). Leshem further teaches zooming in and out of the visualization of network resources to allow the user to focus on the resources of interest (e.g. in column 2 lines 27-32 and 55-57 and figures 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the zoom techniques of Slatter to the visualization of Leshem for the purpose of allowing the user to automatically focus on the resources of interest.

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **prior to replacing said current display, further zooming and positioning said future display area such that a resource of interest is proximate at least two edges of said future display area** (figure 2, paragraph 28, and paragraph 50).

As per independent claim 18, Slatter teaches **a computer-readable medium that stores computer-executable process steps** (e.g. in paragraph 14, a computer readable medium storing the computer-executable process steps is inherent in order to perform the processing taught by Slatter) **for zooming in/out a current display of a visualization of resources** (e.g. in paragraphs 1-2, 45, and 55-59), **each said resource having zero or more attributes** (e.g. in paragraphs 15-16 and 35-36), **and each said resource being a resource of interest if it has at least one attribute that matches predetermined criteria** (e.g. in paragraphs 15-16 and 35-36), **said computer-executable process steps causing a computer to perform the steps of: computing a future display area zoomed in/out from said current display by an**

initial factor (e.g. in paragraph 15, *generates crop boundaries for each area of interest* and in paragraph 26-27, *view that area of interest with a level of zoom selected automatically by the image processor or selected by the user*); **positioning said future display area over said visualization to include the largest possible number of resource of interest** (e.g. in paragraph 28, *include as many of the areas of interest as possible*); and **replacing said current display with a view of said future display area** (e.g. in paragraph 14 and paragraph 29, *shows each of the views in turn*), but does not specifically teach wherein the visualization of resources include a visualization of **network** resources. However, Leshem teaches a visualization of network resources (e.g. in abstract and figures 1-3), each network resource being of interest to the user if an attribute of the resource matches a predetermined criteria (e.g. in column 3 lines 1-3 and 21-30). Leshem further teaches zooming in and out of the visualization of network resources to allow the user to focus on the resources of interest (e.g. in column 2 lines 27-32 and 55-57 and figures 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the zoom techniques of Slatter to the visualization of Leshem for the purpose of allowing the user to automatically focus on the resources of interest.

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated and Slatter further teaches **prior to replacing said current display, further zooming and positioning said future display area such that a resource of interest is proximate at least two edges of said future display area** (figure 2, paragraph 28, and paragraph 50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slatter (US 2003/0025812 A1) in view of Leshem (US 6,341,310) as applied to the claims above and further in view of Goldberg (US 6,341,183).

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Slatter teaches **an initial factor** (e.g. in paragraphs 26 and 28), but does not specifically teach **in the range from 115% to 130% for a zoom in, and in the range from 70% to 85% for a zoom out**. However, it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made for a zoom factor to include the range from 115% to 130% for a zoom in, and the range from 70% to 85% for a zoom out. Goldberg teaches zoom ranges from 25% to 800% (e.g. in column 5 lines 63-65), which include the above ranges. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Slatter with those zoom ranges to provide initial zooming in those ranges.

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Slatter teaches **an initial factor** (e.g. in paragraphs 26 and 28), but does not specifically teach **120% for a zoom in, and 80% for a zoom out**. However, it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made for a zoom factor to include 120% for a zoom in, and 80% for a zoom out. Goldberg teaches zoom ranges from 25% to 800% (e.g. in column 5 lines

63-65), which include the above factors. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Slatter with those zoom factors to provide initial zooming in those ranges.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slatter (US 2003/0025812 A1) in view of Leshem (US 6,341,310) as applied to the claims above and further in view of Smith (US 2003/0132944 A1).

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Slatter teaches **attributes that match a predetermined criteria** (e.g. in paragraphs 15-16 and 35-36), but does not specifically teach **attributes selected by a user**. However, Smith teaches the attributes selected by a user (e.g. in paragraphs 8, 136, and 145). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Slatter with the user-selected attributes of Smith to provide the user with control over which attributes are of interest.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 5295244 A	Network management system using interconnected hierarchies to represent different network dimensions in multiple display views	Dev; Roger H. et al.
US 6271845 B1	Method and structure for dynamically drilling down through a health monitoring map to determine the health status and cause of health problems associated with network objects of a managed network environment	Richardson; David E
US 6470383 B1	System and methods for generating and displaying web site usage data	Leshem; Eran et al.
US 20030046390 A1	Systems and methods for construction multi-layer topological models of computer networks	Ball, Scott et al.
US 6549944 B1	Use of server access logs to generate scripts and scenarios for exercising and evaluating performance of web sites	Weinberg; Amir et al.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Wong whose telephone number is 571-270-1399. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 EST with every other Friday 7:30-4.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/811,541
Art Unit: 2178

Page 13

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William Wong/


ADAM L. BASEHOAR
12/03/07